## **REMARKS**

Several claims has been amended such that the preamble of the dependent claims are consistent with the preamble of the independent claim.

## § 102 Rejections

Claims 1, 3-5, 11-13 and 18-24 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Koike et al. (US 6345903).

## § 103 Rejections

Claims 2, 6-10, 14-17 and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koike et al. as applied above to claim 1.

It is the Examiner's position that the light-emitting diode of Koike et al. (US 6345903) reads upon the organic electronic light-emitting device of claim 1 because the diode is encapsulated with an epoxy resin that includes a wavelength converting material of Koike et al., and such is equivalent to a small molecule emitter.

Claims 1 and 26 has been amended to recite "an organic electronic light-emitting device comprising a light-emitting layer comprising <u>a light-emitting polymer</u>, a doped light-emitting polymer, or a blended light-emitting polymer".

Koike et al. does not teach a device wherein the light-emitting layer comprises any type of light emitting polymer.

Claim 35 is identical to claim 1 except that the light-emitting layer **consists of** an organic electroluminescent material containing a small molecule emitter or a light-emitting small molecule doped polymer.

Application No.: 10/701337 Case No.: 59000US002

Since the device of Koike et al. clearly includes a light emitting diode, the device Koike et al. no longer reads upon the claimed organic electronic light-emitting device of claim 35.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

December 21, 2006 By: /Carolyn A. Fischer/

Date Carolyn A. Fischer, Reg. No.: 39,091

Telephone No.: 651-575-3915

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel 3M Innovative Properties Company

Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833